arXiv:math/0301181v1 [math.CV] 17 Jan 2003

Pluripolar graphs are holomorphic.

N. V. Shcherbina

Abstract. Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous function. We prove that the graph $\Gamma(f)$ of the function f is a pluripolar subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ if and only if f is holomorphic.

1. Introduction

A real-valued function φ defined on a domain $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is called *plurisubharmonic* in U if φ is upper semicontinuous and its restriction to the components of the intersection of a complex line with U is subharmonic.

A set $E \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is called *pluripolar* if there is a neighbourhood U of E and a plurisubharmonic function φ on U such that $E \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\}$. By a result of B. Josefson [J], the function φ in this definition can be chosen to be plurisubharmonic in the whole of $\mathbb{C}^n$ (i.e. $U = \mathbb{C}^n$).

Several years ago Chirka [C] raised the following question:

Let Δ be a unit disc in $\mathbb{C}_z$ and let $f : \Delta \to \mathbb{C}_w$ be a continuous function such that its graph $\Gamma(f)$ is a pluripolar subset of $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$. Does it follow that f is holomorphic?

The main result of this paper gives a positive answer to this question and can be formulated as follows.

Theorem. *Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous function. The graph $\Gamma(f)$ of the function f is a pluripolar subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ if and only if f is holomorphic.*

Remark. The statement of the Theorem looks very similar to the classical Hartogs theorem which says that if Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ is a continuous function such that its graph $\Gamma(f)$ is locally pseudoconcave in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, then f is holomorphic. The difference is that the assumption of pluripolarity of $\Gamma(f)$ in the Theorem implies (at least in the case when $\Gamma(f)$ is complete pluripolar) that the *complement* of $\Gamma(f)$ is pseudoconcave. But the assumption of pluripolarity of $\Gamma(f)$ is actually much stronger than the assumption of pseudoconcavity of the

complement of $\Gamma(f)$. For example, the graph of the function $w = \bar{z}$ is totally real and therefore its complement is pseudoconcave, while this function is obviously not holomorphic (and its graph is not pluripolar).

2. Preliminaries

For a compact set K in $\mathbb{C}^n$, the *polynomial hull* $\hat{K}$ of K is defined as

$$\hat{K} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |P(z)| \leq \sup_{w \in K} |P(w)| \text{ for all holomorphic polynomials } P \text{ in } \mathbb{C}^n\}.$$

The set K is called *polynomially convex* if $\hat{K} = K$.

A characterization of polynomially convex sets in terms of plurisubharmonic functions is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *A compact set K in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is polynomially convex if and only if for any point $Q \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$ there is a plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^n$ function φ such that*

$$\sup_{z \in K} \varphi(z) < \varphi(Q). \tag{1}$$

Proof. To prove necessity, we suppose that K is polynomially convex and consider an arbitrary point Q of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$. Then, by the definition of polynomial convexity, there is a holomorphic polynomial P in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\sup_{z \in K} |P(z)| < |P(Q)|$. Therefore, for the function $\varphi(z) = \log |P(z)|$, plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^n$, one obviously has $\sup_{z \in K} \varphi(z) < \varphi(Q)$.

To prove sufficiency, we argue by contradiction and assume that there is a point $Q \in \hat{K} \setminus K$ such that inequality (1) holds for some function φ plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Taking, if necessary, a convolution of φ with a smooth positive function with small enough support and adding a function $\varepsilon|z|^2$ with small enough positive ε, we can assume that the function φ satisfying (1) is smooth and strictly plurisubharmonic. It follows from (1) that $\sup_{z \in K} \varphi(z) < \sup_{z \in \hat{K}} \varphi(z)$ and, therefore, there is a point $Q^* \in \hat{K} \setminus K$ such that $\varphi(Q^*) = \sup_{z \in \hat{K}} \varphi(z) > \sup_{z \in K} \varphi(z)$. We then conclude from the strict plurisubharmonicity of the function φ that Q^* is the local maximum modulus point of $\hat{K}$ for some polynomial P holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Hence, by Rossi's "local maximum modulus principle" (see, for example [W], p.52), Q^* is a peak point for holomorphic polynomials on K which contradicts the fact that $Q^* \in \hat{K} \setminus K$ and the definition of polynomial convexity. $\square$

Lemma 2 *Let K be a polynomially convex compact set in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let E be a pluripolar compact set in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the set $(\widehat{K \cup E}) \setminus K$ is pluripolar.*

Proof. From pluripolarity of the set E it follows that there is a function φ_E, plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^n$, such that $E \subset \{\varphi_E = -\infty\}$. To prove Lemma 2, we shall prove that $(\widehat{K \cup E}) \setminus K \subset \{\varphi_E = -\infty\}$.

Assume, by contradiction, that there is a point $Q \in (\widehat{K \cup E}) \setminus K$ such that $\varphi_E(Q) > -\infty$. Since $Q \notin K$, and since the set K is polynomially convex, it follows from Lemma 1 that there is a function φ_K, plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^n$, such that $\sup_{z \in K} \varphi_K(z) < \varphi_K(Q)$. Then, for ε positive and small enough, one also has that $\sup_{z \in K}(\varphi_K(z) + \varepsilon\varphi_E(z)) < \varphi_K(Q) + \varepsilon\varphi_E(Q)$. Since $\varphi_E(z) = -\infty$ for $z \in E$, it follows that $\sup_{z \in (K \cup E)}(\varphi_K(z) + \varepsilon\varphi_E(z)) < \varphi_K(Q) + \varepsilon\varphi_E(Q)$. By Lemma 1 applied to the function $\varphi_K + \varepsilon\varphi_E$, we get that $Q \notin (\widehat{K \cup E})$. This gives the desired contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 3 *Let U be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u \subset \mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}(w = u + iv)$, let $g : bU \to \mathbb{R}_v$ be a continuous function and let $\Gamma(g)$ be the graph of g. Then $U \subset \pi(\widehat{\Gamma(g)})$, where $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \to \mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ is the projection.*

Proof. Consider an approximation of the domain U by an increasing sequence $\{U_n\}$ of domains with smooth boundary. Further, consider a sequence of smooth functions $\{g_n\}$, $g_n : bU_n \to \mathbb{R}_v$, which approximate the function g, i.e., $\Gamma(g_n) \to \Gamma(g)$ in the Hausdorff metric. Then it follows from the definition of polynomial hull that $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \widehat{\Gamma(g_n)} \subset \widehat{\Gamma(g)}$, where convergence is understood to be in the Hausdorff metric. Hence, it is enough to prove the statement of Lemma 3 in the case where the domain U has a smooth boundary and the function g is smooth.

Now we argue by contradiction and suppose that there is a point $Q \in U \setminus \pi(\Gamma(\widehat{(g)}))$. Without loss of generality we may assume that Q is the origin O in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$. We know by Browder [B] that $\check{H}^2(\widehat{\Gamma(g)}), \mathbb{C}) = 0$ (here $\check{H}^2(\widehat{\Gamma(g)}), \mathbb{C})$ is the second Čech cohomology group with complex coefficients). Then, by Alexander duality (see, for example [S], p.296), we get $H_1(\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \setminus \widehat{\Gamma(g)}, \mathbb{C}) = \check{H}^2(\widehat{\Gamma(g)}), \mathbb{C}) = 0$ (here $H_1(\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \setminus \widehat{\Gamma(g)}, \mathbb{C})$ is the first singular homology group with complex coefficients). On the other hand, since $O \in U \setminus \widehat{\Gamma(g)}$, it follows that the curve γ_r consisting of the segment $\{z = 0, u = 0, -R \leq v \leq R\}$ and the half-circle $\{z = 0, w = \mathrm{R}e^{i\theta}, -\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ do not intersect the set $\widehat{\Gamma(g)}$ for R big enough. Moreover, the linking number of $\Gamma(g)$ and γ_R is not equal to zero. Therefore, $H_1(\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \setminus \widehat{\Gamma(g)}, \mathbb{C}) \neq 0$. This is a contradiction and the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 4 *Let U be a simply connected domain in $\mathbb{C}_z$ and let $f(z) = u(z) + iv(z) : U \to \mathbb{C}_w$ be a function such that both $u(z)$ and $v(z)$ are harmonic in U. Then the graph $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar if and only if f is holomorphic.*

Proof. If f is holomorphic, then the function $\varphi(z,w) = \ln|w - f(z)|$ is defined and plurisubharmonic in $U \times \mathbb{C}_w$ and $\Gamma(f) = \{\varphi = -\infty\}$. Therefore, the set $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar.

If f is not holomorphic, we argue by contradiction and suppose that the set $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar. Then there is a function φ, plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$, such that $\Gamma(f) \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\}$. Let $\tilde{v}$ be the harmonic conjugate function to u in the domain U such that $\tilde{v}(z_0) = v(z_0)$ for some fixed point $z_0 \in U$. Then the set $\{z \in U : \tilde{v}(z) + \varepsilon = v(z)\}$ is nonempty and consists of real analytic curves for all ε small enough. Therefore, each of the holomorphic curves $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \{(z,w) : z \in U, w = u(z) + i(\tilde{v}(z) + \varepsilon)\}$ intersects the set $\Gamma(f) \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\}$ in real analytic curves. Since a real analytic curve is not polar (see, for example [T, Th.II.26, p.50]), it follows that $\Gamma_\varepsilon \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\}$ for all ε small enough. This implies that $\varphi \equiv -\infty$ in $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$ and gives the desired contradiction. □

3. Proof of Theorem

If the function f is holomorphic, then the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4 shows that $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar. Namely, the function

$$\varphi(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) = \ln|z_{n+1} - f(z_1, \dots, z_n)|$$

is plurisubharmonic in $\Omega \times \mathbb{C}$ and $\Gamma(f) = \{\varphi = -\infty\}$. Therefore, the set $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

Suppose now that the graph $\Gamma(f)$ of f is pluripolar. To prove that f is holomorphic we consider two cases.

1. The special case $n = 1$. In this case Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{C}_z$ and $f(z) = u(z) + iv(z) : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}_w$ is a continuous function such that its graph is pluripolar. Since holomorphicity is a local property, we can restrict ourselves to the case when Ω is a disc in $\mathbb{C}_z$ and, moreover, to simplify our notations, we can assume without loss of generality that $\Omega = \Delta = \{z : |z| < 1\}$ is the unit disc and that the function f is continuous on its closure $\bar{\Delta}$. It follows from Lemma 4 that either the function f is holomorphic or at least one of the functions u and v is not harmonic. Since both cases can be treated the same way, we can, to get a contradiction, assume that the function u is not harmonic. Denote by $\tilde{u}$ the solution of the Dirichlet problem on Δ with boundary data u. Since u is not harmonic, one has that $\tilde{u} \neq u$ in Δ. Without loss of generality we can assume that

$$u(z_0) < \tilde{u}(z_0) \tag{2}$$

for some $z_0 \in \Delta$. Let

$$C = \max\{\sup_{z \in \bar{\Delta}} |u(z)|, \sup_{z \in \bar{\Delta}} |v(z)|\}.$$

Consider the set

$$K = \{(z, w) \in \bar{\Delta} \times \mathbb{C}_w : \tilde{u}(z) \leq u \leq 3C, |v| \leq C\}.$$

Lemma 5 *The set K is polynomially convex.*

Proof. To prove polynomial convexity of K we use Lemma 1. Consider an arbitrary point $(z^*, w^*) \in \mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \setminus K$. If the point (z^*, w^*) belongs to the set

$$A_1 = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} : |z| > 1 \text{ or } u > 3C \text{ or } |v| > C\},$$

then inequality (1) will be satisfied for the point $Q = (z^*, w^*)$ and the function

$$\varphi_1(z, w) = \max\{|z| - 1, u - 3C, |v| - C\}$$

plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$.

If the point (z^*, w^*) belongs to the set

$$A_2 = \{(z, w) \in \bar{\Delta} \times \mathbb{C}_w : u < \tilde{u}(z)\},$$

then $u^* < \tilde{u}(z^*)$. Let $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{u}(z^*) - u^*)$ and consider a function $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$ harmonic on the whole of $\mathbb{C}_z$ such that $\max_{z \in \bar{\Delta}} |\tilde{u}(z) - \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(z)| < \varepsilon$. Since for $(z, w) \in K$ one has $u \geq \tilde{u}(z) \geq \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(z) - \varepsilon$, and since $u^* = \tilde{u}(z^*) - 3\varepsilon < \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(z^*) - 2\varepsilon$, it follows that inequality (1) will be satisfied for the point $Q = (z^*, w^*)$ and the function

$$\varphi_2(z, w) = \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(z) - u$$

plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$.

Since $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w} \setminus K = A_1 \cup A_2$, we conclude from Lemma 1 that the set K is polynomially convex. This completes the proof of Lemma 5. $\square$

Consider now the domain

$$U = \{(z, u) \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}_u : u(z) < u < u(z) + 2C\}$$

in $\mathbb{C}_z \times \mathbb{R}_u$ and the real-valued function $g(z, u) = v(z)$ on bU. Since $\sup_{z \in \bar{\Delta}} |u(z)| \leq C$, one has $\sup_{z \in \bar{\Delta}} |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C$ and hence $\tilde{u}(z) \leq u(z) + 2C \leq 3C$. It then follows from the definitions of U and g that the graph $\Gamma(g)$ of the function g is contained in the set $\Gamma(f) \cup K$. Therefore, we get $\widehat{\Gamma(g)} \subset (\Gamma(f) \cup K)\widehat{\ }$. Since, by Lemma 3, $\pi(\widehat{\Gamma(g)}) \supset U$, we conclude that

$$\pi(\Gamma(f) \cup K)\widehat{\ } \supset U. \tag{3}$$

Consider the following open subset of U :

$$\tilde{U} = \{(z,u) \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}_u : u(z) < u < \tilde{u}(z)\}.$$

Inequality (2) obviously implies that the set $\tilde{U}$ is nonempty. Since, by the definition of the sets K and $\tilde{U}$, $\pi(K) \cap \tilde{U} = \emptyset$, it follows from (3) that

$$\pi((\widehat{\Gamma(f) \cup K}) \setminus K) \supset \tilde{U}. \tag{4}$$

Since, by our assumption, the graph $\Gamma(f)$ of f is pluripolar, we conclude from Lemma 3 and Lemma 5 that the set $(\widehat{\Gamma(f) \cup K}) \setminus K$ is pluripolar, i.e.,

$$(\widehat{\Gamma(f) \cup K}) \setminus K \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\} \tag{5}$$

for some plurisubharmonic function φ.

From (2) one has that there is a neighbourhood V of the point z_0 in $\mathbb{C}_z$ such that

$$u(z) < \tilde{u}(z) \tag{6}$$

for all $z \in V$. For each $a \in \mathbb{C}$ consider the complex line $\ell_a = \{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z = a\}$ and the set

$$E_a = ((\widehat{\Gamma(f) \cup K}) \setminus K) \cap \ell_a.$$

It follows from (4) and (6) that for $a \in V$ the projection of E_a on the real line $\ell_a \cap \{v = 0\}$ contains an open segment. Since a polar set in $\mathbb{C}$ has Hausdorff dimension zero (see, for example [T, Th.III.19, p.65]), it cannot be projected on an open segment in $\mathbb{R}$. Therefore, the set E_a is not polar. It then follows from (5) that $\varphi \equiv -\infty$ on ℓ_a. Since this argument holds true for all $a \in V$, we conclude that $\varphi \equiv -\infty$ on $\mathbb{C}^2_{z,w}$. This contradiction proves the Theorem in the case $n = 1$.

2. The general case. Let k be one of the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, n$. For each $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in \Omega$ consider the function

$$f^{\mathbf{a}}_k(z_k) = f(a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}, z_k, a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_n)$$

defined on the domain

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{a}}_k = \Omega \cap \{z_1 = a_1, \ldots, z_{k-1} = a_{k-1}, z_{k+1} = a_{k+1}, \ldots, z_n = a_n\} \subset \mathbb{C}_{z_k}.$$

Since, by our assumptions, the set $\Gamma(f)$ is pluripolar, there is a function φ, plurisubharmonic in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, such that $\Gamma(f) \subset \{\varphi = -\infty\}$. For all points $\mathbf{a}$ except for a pluripolar set in $\mathbb{C}^n$ one obviously has that the function

$$\varphi^{\mathbf{a}}_k(z_k, z_{n+1}) = \varphi(a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}, z_k, a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_n, z_{n+1})$$

is not identically equal to $-\infty$ in $\mathbb{C}^2_{z_k, z_{n+1}}$. For all such points $\mathbf{a}$ we can use the argument from case 1 and conclude from continuity of the function $f^{\mathbf{a}}_k$:

$\Omega_k^{\mathbf{a}} \to \mathbb{C}_{z_{n+1}}$ and from the inclusion $\Gamma(f_k^{\mathbf{a}}) \subset \{\varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}} = -\infty\}$ that the function $f_k^{\mathbf{a}}$ is holomorphic. Since the complement of a pluripolar set is everywhere dense, it follows from continuity of f that the functions $f_k^{\mathbf{a}}$ are holomorphic for all $\mathbf{a} \in \Omega$. This argument holds true for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, so we conclude from the classical Hartogs theorem on separate analyticity that the function f is holomorphic. The proof of the Theorem is now completed. □

References

[B] A. Browder, Cohomology of maximal ideal spaces, Bull. Amer. Math, Soc. **67** (1961), 515-516.

[C] E. M. Chirka, Oral communication, Banach Center, 1997.

[J] B. Josefson, On the equivalence between locally polar and globally polar sets for plurisubharmonic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$, Ark. Mat. **16** (1978), 109-115.

[S] E. Spanier, Algebraic topology, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1966.

[T] M. Tsuji, Potential theory in modern function theory, Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo, 1959.

[W] J. Wermer, Banach Algebras and Several Complex Variables. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, N 35. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.

N. V. Shcherbina
Department of Mathematics
University of Göteborg
S-41296 Göteborg
SWEDEN
e-mail: nikolay@math.chalmers.se